DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 376 FL 026 368

AUTHOR	Wong, Jean
TITLE	"Applying" Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics: Evaluating English as a Second Language Textbook Dialogue.
PUB DATE	2000-03-00
NOTE	46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Vancouver, BC, Canada, March 14-18, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Applied Linguistics; *Communicative Competence (Languages); Connected Discourse; *Dialogs (Language); *Discourse Analysis; *English (Second Language); Language Research; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Speech Acts; *Telephone Communications Systems; *Textbooks
IDENTIFIERS	Conversational Analysis

ABSTRACT

This article examines English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) textbook telephone dialogues against the backdrop about what is reported about real telephone interaction based in research in conversation analysis (CA). An analysis of eight ESL textbooks reveals that the fit between what conversation analysts say about the nature of natural telephone conversation and that found in textbooks is unsatisfactory. Sequences such as summon-answer, identification, greeting, and how are you, often found in naturally occurring telephone exchanges, are absent, incomplete, or problematic in the textbook dialogues examined. The article argues that as the focus in language pedagogy increasingly turns toward the development of teaching materials that are informed by studies in discourse analysis, it may be important for materials writers and language teachers to pay attention to interconnections among language (or talk), sequence structure, and social action. The opening of a telephone conversation is an interactionally demanding task, not one done effortlessly or automatically as in textbook dialogues. The juxtaposition of natural telephone conversation with textbook conversation displays the tension between linguistic competence and linguistic performance, between understanding language as process and language as product. (Contains 52 references.) (Author/KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 444 376

"Applying" Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics: Evaluating English as a Second Language Textbook Dialogue[1]

Jean Wong
The College of New Jersey
(formerly Trenton State College)
P.O. Box 7718
Ewing, NJ 08628
Tel: 609 771-2440
Fax: 609 683-7580
jwong@tcnj.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jean Wong

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

---

[1] This paper began as a master's thesis which I completed at the University of California, Los Angeles (1984; see bibiliography). I remain grateful to my master's thesis committee members: Evelyn Hatch, Manny Schegloff, and Marianne Celce-Murcia. Manny Schegloff is thanked in particular for serving as the primary supervisor of the thesis research and for providing further bibiliographic references in this revised and updated version. Various drafts of the current version were presented at the annual conventions of the National Communication Association (November, 1999) in Chicago, IL and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (March, 2000) in Vancouver, B.C.. The paper is also part of an invited panel "Conversation Analysis: A Methodological Resource for SLA in the New Milennium" at the Second Language Research Forum annual convention (September, 2000) in Madison, WI. I thank the participants who attended my conference presentations and offered valuable comments. Remaining errors are mine. Correspondence to: Jean Wong, The College of New Jersey, P.O. Box 7718, Ewing, NJ 08628 (jwong@tcnj.edu).

FL028368

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This article examines English as a Second Language (ESL) textbook telephone dialogues against the backdrop of what is reported about real telephone interaction based on research in conversation analysis (CA). An analysis of 8 ESL textbooks reveals that the fit between what conversation analysts say about the nature of natural telephone conversation and that found in textbooks is unsatisfactory. Sequences such as summon-answer, identification, greeting, and how are you, often found in naturally occurring telephone exchanges, are absent, incomplete, or problematic in the textbook dialogues examined. The article argues that as the focus in language pedagogy increasingly turns toward the development of teaching materials which are informed by studies in discourse analysis, it may be important for materials writers and language teachers to pay attention to interconnections among language (or talk), sequence structure, and social action. The opening of a telephone conversation is, in some respects, an interactionally-demanding task, not one done effortlessly or automatically as in textbook dialogues. The juxtaposition of natural telephone conversation with textbook telephone 'conversation' displays the tension between linguistic competence and linguistic performance, between understanding language as process and language as product.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Applying" Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics: Evaluating English as a Second Language Textbook 'Conversation'

Introduction

This article reports on a study which compares the structure of telephone conversations in English as a second language (ESL) textbooks with that found in conversation analysis (CA) research. The study highlights some of the ways in which textbook conversations differ from the findings of empirical studies. The mismatch between textbooks and naturally-occurring language has implications for teachers and materials writers especially since dialogues of the sort analyzed frequently appear in textbooks marketed as offering authentic, natural language, or language which is true to life.

Overall, the themes raised in this study find resonance with scholars who address issues in discourse and language education (McCarthy, 1991; Hatch, 1992; McCarthy & Carter, 1994). McCarthy (1991) advocates using discourse analysis as a means of enriching our understanding of classroom teaching materials. In a similar vein, Candlin (1991) calls for discourse analytic studies of an interdisciplinary nature in the advancement of language teacher education:

> While its focus remains in the description of language, grammar, lexis, phonology, and discourse, an understanding of the curriculum landscape now requires insights from cognitive psychology and sociology, from studies in ideology and media studies, from conversational analysis, and ethnography and from cultural history. It widens the scope of language learner education but also,

perhaps more uncomfortable, of language teacher education. (McCarthy, 1991, p. ix)

Responding to Candlin's call for research of an interdisciplinary nature, in this project I evaluate the openings of ESL textbook telephone dialogues against the backdrop of insights noted in CA about the sequence structure of telephone conversation beginnings. I examine a corpus of textbook dialogues in order to see whether the sequences described in CA as canonical of real American English telephone openings are found in textbook 'conversations.' After all, if one of the goals of language education is to teach our students how to be communicatively competent (Hymes, 1967, 1972), perhaps we ought to consider whether our textbook dialogues model for language learners the sorts of discourse patterns and sequence structures that recur in ordinary telephone interaction.

I now provide some background on the notion of sequence structure, which is followed by an overview of the core sequences found in ordinary telephone talk. The discussion offers a cursory look at what it is that we take for granted and assume comes seemingly effortlessly or automatically when engaging in telephone conversation. For most of this background, I draw from the research of Schegloff (1967, 1968, 1979, 1986) whose pioneering efforts on telephone interaction remain foundational in the field of communication studies.[1]

Sequence Structure

From the perspective of CA, sequence structure provides a natural environment for all interactions (Schegloff, 1995). Crúcial to an understanding of this notion is the observation that participants rely on the placement of an utterance as a resource for

understanding what is going on in the talk. Talk and action are inextricably tied to the structure of their occurrence (Schegloff, 1997, 1993, 1986).

Two turns are central to an understanding of the connection between talk and action, namely, current and next turns. A current turn will project a range of next or second actions. This feature of mundane conversation is referred to as the 'sequential implicativeness' (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) of a turn-at-talk whereby a next turn is heard as some sort of analysis, appreciation, understanding, or the like, of the just prior turn at talk.

The adjacency pair (Schegloff, 1995) is one of the tighter links that this form of current and next turn relationship may take. These sorts of sequences typically have a strong impact on the directionality of the talk as well as on the "type" of talk that occurs. A particular sort of first pair part (greeting, invitation, etc.) makes 'conditionally relevant' (Schegloff, 1972) in immediate juxtaposition i.e., the next turn, a particular sort of second pair part (return greeting, acceptance/declination of the invitation, etc.). One impact of the adjacency pair format is that it provides a normative framework (Heritage, 1984) by which next actions are understood. That a particular sort of action is 'due' in the next turn provides the basis by which silence, no response (e.g., no return greeting), or the like, are viewed as accountable matters in the everyday world.

Yet regardless of whether one is dealing with the larger territory of sequence organization or its subdomain of adjacency pair structure, what is crucial to understand is that in aspects of sequence organization we get a sense of the coordinated character of social interaction on a turn-by-turn basis. It is a coordination of activities, an organization of actions, that is achieved by and for participants, moreover, at a level of detail far more

subtle than one might have imagined. Entry into a conversation, as in the case of a telephone opening, represents one tack that this coordinated effort may take.

The opening of a telephone conversation is not to be viewed as something which just happens or as merely the segment of the talk which is preliminary to an interaction for, indeed, what and how the first topic of the telephone conversation is arrived at is contingent upon, that is, built from earlier sequences or actions that occur in the opening segment. It takes mutual effort and alignment on the part of interlocutors to get through the opening of an interaction and to reach the place in the talk in which a first topic is proffered or 'anchored' (Schegloff, 1967). If there is one overall job that openings "do" in telephone conversation, it is to work towards first topic position, the place in which topic talk "officially" begins. This is an interactional matter for participants and is one to which they display orientation.

What sort of organization of sequences or actions is relevant in a telephone beginning? What kinds of coordinated activities are implicated in getting through an opening? How is first topic position reached? I now turn to a discussion of these matters in a brief overview of the sequence types canonical of real telephone openings.

Core Sequences of Real Telephone Openings

Telephone talk is not a mere by-product of the technology, namely, the telephone instrument, but is the outcome of an interactional process as reflected in the various sequence types by which a telephone opening is achieved. In telephone openings participants address and align themselves with respect to four basic actions, namely, four sequence types which typically occur in this order: a) summons-answer b) identification-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

recognition c) greeting and d) how are you (Schegloff, 1986). Fragments (1) and (2) illustrate each of the sequence types.

(1) [#247, Schegloff, 1986, p. 115]

[Note: R stands for the recipient/answerer and C stands for the caller.]

		ring	summons/answer sequence
01	R	Hallo	
02	C	Hello, Jim?	identification sequence
03	R	Yeah	
04	C	It's Bonnie.	
05	R	Hi,	greeting sequence
06	C	Hi, how are yuh	first how are you sequence
07	R	Fine, how're you,	second how are you sequence
08	C	Oh, okay I guess	
09	R	Oh, okay,	
10	C	Uhm (0.2) what are you doing New Year's Eve?	

(2) [Schegloff, 1986, #1, p. 114]

01		((ring))	summons-answer sequence
02	Nancy:	H'llo:?	
03	Hyla:	Hi:,	identification and greeting
04	Nancy:	^Hi:.	
05	Hyla:	Hwaryuhh=	first how are you
06	Nancy:	=Fi:ne how'r you,	second how are you
07	Hyla:	Oka: [y	

08 Nancy: [Goo:d,

09 (0.4)

10 Hyla: mkhhh [hhh

11 Nancy: What's doin,

Each of the sequence types exemplified in the examples above addresses a different organizational task as I elaborate below.

Summons-answer (SA) Sequence

Both the summoning of a party to an interaction and the response which the summoned party produces represent organized actions of everyday human contact. A summons-answer (SA) sequence constitutes a preliminary sequence in a telephone exchange. When a caller dials a telephone and it rings, that summons, namely the ringing of the telephone, requires an answer to it to open the channel of communication and to establish the availability of the other party to engage in interaction. As an adjacency pair, the summons is the first part of a two-part sequence; it is not complete without an answer to it. And when an SA sequence is completed, further talk and action are anticipated. The summoner is expected to talk again; the answerer is expected to listen further. Hence the observation has been registered that SA sequences are nonterminal in character (Schegloff, 1967).

Relatedly, Schegloff (1968) notes a "distributive rule for first utterances." Simply put, in telephone conversations it is the answerer who speaks first. This systematic practice of phone conversations is virtually across the board despite the fact that it is the caller who, at least, knows her or his own identity and that of the called party while the answerer does not.

Answers

When a caller has summoned an answerer, the answerer is obliged to provide a response to it such that an interlocutor regularly draws inferences when a response is absent (e.g., no one is home). The process involved in selecting an answer to a ringing telephone reveals something of the sort of information which the answerer has at her or his disposal at that particular moment. In their responses, answerers display their inferences about who the caller is or who the sort of caller is (Schegloff, 1970). According to Schegloff (1970), "the answer is fitted not so much to the summons (though it is that too) as to features of the setting in which the answerer is located, and to which summoner is presumed to be oriented in calling" (Schegloff, 1970, p. 3-7). Moreover, an answerer, by the sort of response that s/he produces when picking up a ringing telephone, displays orientation to the matter that it is in the caller's interest to monitor for whether s/he has reached the called party (Schegloff, 1970, 1972). Answers selected typically include: 'hello,' 'hi,' and 'yeah.'

'Helio'

'Hello' might be regarded as the primary or most common form of response to a telephone summons. When an answerer selects this sort of response, s/he displays that s/he does not have the resources available from which to make inferences about the identity of the caller, the type of caller, the topics to be discussed, etc. An answer such as 'hello' marks a telephone conversation as possibly personal or possibly business; attendant activities may include the establishment of acquaintanceship or the offer of legitimate grounds or reasons for the contact (Schegloff, 1967).

An initial utterance such as "hello" offers the recipient a minimal voice sample which can be used for identification and recognitional purposes about which I say more in a later section. In fact, an answerer frequently deploys a 'signature hello,' (Schegloff, 1986), one which is standard and characteristic for that particular person and by which s/he may be recognized by the caller if such recognition is applicable. It is on that basis that callers frequently comment on a changed voice quality in a telephone opening, for example, when an answerer has a cold and responds with a 'hello' which is somewhat different from how s/he ordinarily responds. This, then, becomes a talked-about matter in the interaction (e.g., 'I didn't recognize your voice.' 'You sound different.' etc.)

"Yeah" or "Hi"

In openings in which the answerer responds to a summons with an utterance such as 'yeah' or 'hi,' an element of foreknownness is involved (Schegloff, 1967). The answerer, by her or his selection of an initial utterance of the type 'yeah' or 'hi', displays some knowledge or inference that s/he has concerning either who the caller is or what type of person is calling. Intercom type calls are exemplary in this regard. They are more frequently answered by 'yeah' or 'hi' than they are by 'hello.' In this kind of call, the answerer often has some knowledge of the identity of the caller or, if not the identity, minimally, some knowledge of the type of person calling, for example, one from the same company, organization, etc. as that of the answerer.

Answerers such as 'yeah' or 'hi' are also used in cases in which one party offers to call the other party back immediately. These situations may involve a faulty phone connection, the need to check out a piece of information and get back in touch, or the like. In fact, were an answerer to respond to an immediate call-back situation with 'hello'

rather than with 'yeah,' or 'hi,' the caller, in her or his first turn might utter "Oh, it's me," which displays that s/he had expected the answerer to have shown her or his foreknowledge of the resumed call. This foreknowledge is displayed by responding to an immediately returned phone call with an answer such as 'yeah' or 'hi' (Schegloff, 1970).

Answerers responding with utterances of the type 'yeah' or 'hi' do not do so arbitrarily. There is an organized set of practices which leads to the selection of a particular type of answer. This set of practices is contingent upon the information that the caller and the answerer have at their disposal at some particular moment. In cases in which 'yeah' or 'hi' are used, there is an orientation by the participants to some sort of pre-knowledge of the interaction, or to the matter that the conversation about to take place is a resumed conversation (Schegloff, 1986). Along these lines, it is emphasized that 'hi' is not an alternate (or more informal) form of 'hello.' It is, more likely, that 'hi' and 'yeah' are variants of one another (Schegloff, 1986).

Self-identification

A third type of answer to a ringing telephone is one in which the answerer self-identifies, e.g. "Bill Jones." A self-identification answer is regarded as pre-emptive identification (Schegloff, 1967) in that it takes away from the caller one of her or his first interactional tasks, which is to provide identification or offer reasons for the call. When an answerer offers self-identification in her or his first turn, any identification done by the caller in the next turn is viewed as subsequent identification (Schegloff, 1970). This subsequent identification may have been produced to display that it was an outcome of the initial self-identification by the answerer, for example, making relevant membership in the same group, class, collection, etc. (Schegloff, 1970).

An organizational task for participants is how to select a form of self-identification, which self-identification answer to select, and so on. Consistent with the notion of recipient design, the selection of a particular form of self-identification is contingent upon the identity and relationship of the participants. For example, an utterance such as 'My name is _____.' is used with strangers while an utterance such as 'This is_____' is more likely used with friends or acquaintances. As Schegloff (1970) notes:

> Indeed, it is not that the relevance of a self-identification form requires the selection of a particular self-identification but that the relevance of a particular identification, germane to answering the phone in the first place, makes relevant the selection of a self-identification form of answer (Schegloff, 1970, p. 3-54)

Schegloff's work on self-identification answers has focused primarily on business type calls, but some researchers have examined the deployment of self-identification answers in ordinary conversation and have observed cultural variation (e.g. Lindstrom, 1994; Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1991; Sifanou, 1989). In Swedish telephone openings, for example, answerers typically provide self-identification (Lindstrom, 1994). A similar finding has been noted in Dutch conversation (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1991). Houtkoop-Steenstra (1991) reports that the use of 'Hallo' in the answerer's first turn caused "puzzlement" as evidenced by a gap of silence between the answerer and the caller's first turns. Moreover, Houtkoop-Steenstra (1991) notes that callers also offer self-identification in their first turn. She attributes the differences in self-identification patterns between Dutch and American interlocutors to different orientations towards

status, commenting that the Dutch are "both less ambiguous and more formal about the local accomplishment of social position as a conversational matter." (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1991, p. 248).

Identification/Recognition Sequence

The interactional tasks of identification and recognition link back to the summons-answer sequence in which an answerer is obliged to produce a response to the ringing telephone. When s/he produces an answer of the sort 'hello,' 'hi,' or 'yeah,' s/he provides a voice sample which may be used for recognitional purposes. The offer of a voice sample (e.g. 'hello') constitutes a 'minimally graded' recognitional resource, one that is preferred for accomplishing mutual identification of the parties (Schegloff, 1979, 1986).[2] Such a 'grading' system reflects the importance of the notions of recipient design and preference structure, which are pervasive throughout the sequences of which a telephone opening is composed. And in the next turn, a caller may invite recognition by voice sample in return, which displays orientation to the matter that the business of identification and recognition may be accomplished seemingly en passant (Schegloff, 1979). But the work of identification and recognition achieved in this manner is not necessarily an arbitrary matter for the "doing" of a telephone opening speaks directly to the identities, intimacies, and relationships that interlocutors have with one another.

Take fragment (2) above, for instance. Nancy's answer, "H'llo:?", is immediately recognized by Hyla who produces a greeting ("Hi:,") in response. Her greeting also offers a minimal voice sample and invites recognition by Nancy. Nancy does indeed recognize Hyla by voice sample alone; this is demonstrated in the turn in which Nancy produces a return greeting. The doing of identification and recognition work, as exemplified in this

fragment, displays something of the intimacy with which the parties know one another. Here we get a sense of how the organized activities of identification, recognition and greeting are achieved simultaneously, moreover, seemingly effortlessly by the participants.

Generally, in the caller's first turn, which is the second turn of the conversation, there are a variety of forms which may be used each of which displays orientation to a selectional process, namely, the choice of whether to offer identification by voice sample (as in the case of a greeting) or by name (Schegloff, 1979). In fragment (1) above, the caller offers a greeting term which is followed by the name of the presumed answerer as a recognitional device. In the next turn, when the answerer responds with the utterance, "yeah," she does not claim recognition of the caller by voice sample. Subsequent to that, the caller provides self-identification in the form of first name only ("It's Bonnie."). That she selects first name only is, again, not an arbitrary matter. The caller provides the minimally needed information necessary for achieving recognition, and does so in a manner that addresses the state or closeness of their relationship. Notably, the offer of a first name only recognitional resource is displayed as sufficient when the participants advance the talk to an exchange of greetings.

More generally, then, the talk which occupies a caller's first turn may lead to different sequence types: greeting, apology ("Did I wake you?"), request ("Is Jessie there?"), question and answer ("Is this the Communist Party?"), etc. (Schegloff, 1979). Schegloff (1979) notes that the "switchboard" request sequence ("Is Jessie there?") is the most common of nine basic types of caller's first turn. Other more common types include greeting term alone or name plus rising or assertive intonation.

Greeting Sequences

Utterances such as 'hello' and 'hi' are common forms of greeting. Greeting sequences are inseparable from the work of identification and recognition (Schegloff, 1986). In this regard, Schegloff (1986) notes that recipients may withhold a return greeting, momentarily at least, when s/he does not recognize the other party so as not to have a return greeting misconstrued as a sign of recognition when recognition had not yet been achieved.

Sacks (1975) notes that whether greeting terms are to be regarded as possibly doing greeting or not is contingent upon their location in the talk. In order for a possible greeting to be viewed as an actual greeting, it must come at the beginning of a conversation, namely, in the first slot or in the first exchange (Sacks, 1975). But this does not imply that any occurrence of 'hello' or 'hi' at the beginning of a conversation constitutes its use as a greeting. It must be produced and oriented to as such by the interlocutors (Schegloff, 1967).

Another feature of greeting sequences is the general rule of one greeting per party per occasion, if reciprocated (Schegloff, 1967). Once an exchange of greetings has been done at the beginning of a conversation, participants engaged in a single conversation do not, at some later point within the same conversation, offer around exchange of greetings. On this point, greeting sequences are not reciprocal exchanges (Schegloff, 1995) as 'how are you' sequences are, which will be addressed momentarily.

The terms 'hello' and 'hi' are not necessarily interchangeable. 'Hi' may be an appropriate greeting term when used between participants who are acquainted with one another. 'Hi' done between acquaintances serves to exchange greetings and to display

recognition of one another as illustrated in fragment (2) above. And if 'hi' were used as a greeting in a situation in which 'hello' ought to have been used, the recipient, upon hearing the 'hi,' might suppose that the greeting was misdirected. Thus aside from serving as a sign of recognition, an exchange of 'hi's' may also serve to reveal that the interactants know one another on more informal and/or more intimate terms (Schegloff, 1967).

How are you (HAY) Sequences

Unlike greeting sequences in which, as stated above, only one such exchange per conversation is the rule, HAY sequences are regarded as reciprocal or exchange sequences (Schegloff, 1995). One participant initiates a 'how are you' question to another participant who responds to it, and subsequent to that, that recipient reciprocates by returning (a rendition of) the same question.[3] In other words, unlike other sequence types canonical of telephone beginnings, this sequence type may be done twice, once as a first HAY sequence and again as a second HAY sequence.

It is a regular practice of telephone conversation that callers initiate the first topic of the conversation. This practice has been shown to be tied to the ordering of first and second HAY sequences. Schegloff (1986) observes that callers regularly position themselves to be the asker of the first 'how are you' in order to later assume the position of being recipient or answerer of the second 'how are you.' This interactional design and effect is strategic because it is from the 'position' of being the answerer or recipient of the second HAY that the caller has the opportunity to expand, shape, or convert her or her answer to the HAY into the first topic of the conversation. Nonetheless, on occasions an answerer of the first 'how are you' e.g., the call-recipient, may preempt (Schegloff, 1986)

this position and opportunity from the caller and initiate the first topic. An instance of this kind is discussed momentarily.

How and what gets talked about in the opening spate of talk will have a bearing on what and how the first topic of the conversation is accomplished. Moreover, what gets talked about as the first topic will, in turn, affect what gets said and done in subsequent sequences. These observations find particular resonance in a consideration of first and second HAY sequences because some answerers to the question 'how are you' are expansion relevant while others are closure relevant. It is the expansion form of answer which is more likely to move participants out of the opening segment and into the first topic. Reaching this position (of first topic) takes coordination and collaboration by the interlocutors on a turn-by-turn basis. When this position is arrived at, the opening of the conversation generally terminates and topic talk begins. These are all aspects of a telephone opening which are socially constructed and oriented to by participants.

How is it that some answers to the question 'how are you' get expanded and provide an entry into the first topic of the conversation? Sacks (1975) observes that there are three sorts of answers to the question 'how are you.' There are neutral type answers, e.g. 'good,' 'okay,' 'fine,' etc. which are closure relevant; these answers typically do not lead to more talk concerning the recipient's state of being. Alternatively, there are plus and minus type answers, e.g. 'great,' 'terrific,' 'super,' 'terrible,' 'awful,' 'depressed,' which are expansion relevant. These answers more likely lead to extended talk concerning why the recipient is feeling unusually 'positive' or 'minus.' According to Sacks (1975), the selection of an answer to the question 'how are you' involves roughly two steps. The first step involves monitoring, the selection of the type of HAY answer, i.e. minus, plus, or

neutral. The second step involves selection of an appropriate term within the type already chosen, i.e. 'lousy,' 'great,' 'okay,' and the like.

Thus a central point regarding the interactional import of HAY sequences is that the asker of an HAY question provides its recipient with the occasion to convert her or his answer to the question 'how are you' into the first topic of the conversation. In the instance below, notice that it is the answerer of the telephone summons who uses her response to the question 'how are you' to launch into topic talk. In doing so, she preempts the caller's getting to her first topic "first," which is, more often than not, how interlocutors move out of openings and into topic talk. Here the answerer's response to the 'how are you' is a neutral form ("I'm pretty go::od"), but it is prefaced by the token "Oh" (Jefferson, 1980).

(3) [Schegloff, #115]

Agnes: ((Hello))

Portia: ((Hello))

Agnes: Hi honey, How are yuh.

→ Portia: Fine, how're you.

→ Agnes: hhhhhhh Oh, I'm pretty go::od, I hadda liddle operation on my toe this week, I hadtuh have- toenail taken off.

Jefferson (1980) observes that when an answer to the question 'how are you' is Oh-prefaced, something special may be going on. The token "Oh" may provide an occasion for talk about troubles. Here the answerer, Agnes, informs Portia about a toenail operation that she had recently undergone.

With the foregoing cursory look at openings in real telephone interaction, I have now arrived at my first topic, ready to discuss the textbook analysis.

The Data

It was difficult to find ESL textbooks which contained telephone dialogues. Since I restricted my analysis to textbooks published primarily in the 1990s, I was limited to a corpus of 30 dialogues.[4] This research is therefore meant to be suggestive and not definitive. But I note that the results of this study, by and large, reconfirm an earlier investigation of a similar nature involving 21 dialogues (cf. Wong, 1984).

Summons-answer Sequences: ESL Textbook Telephone Dialogues

Only 3 of the 30 textbook dialogues contained complete summons-answer sequences. Of these, there were no answers of the form 'yeah' or 'hi.' Fragment (4) is illustrative.

(4) [Word of Mouth, p. 49]

→ Kim: (Phone rings) Hello?

Matt: Hi. Is Kim there?

Kim: This is Kim.

As compared with transcriptions of real telephone openings in CA, notice that the telephone ring and the recipient's answer occur in the same turn. In real telephone interaction, a telephone rings first and subsequent to that an answerer picks up the receiver and responds. In CA, this ordering of activities is displayed in transcription with the ringing of the telephone occupying its own slot, namely, turn one. The sequences of which telephone openings are composed are regarded as organized activities which are ordered into first and second pair parts. This ordering is consequential to the interaction.

To display the telephone summons and its answer in the same turn, as this textbook example does, does not necessarily give a sense of the social consequences involved in the "doing" of first and second pair parts, more importantly, the "doing" of actions such as the summoning of the party and its response.

In fact, when a telephone initially rings, there are interactional concerns such as who is a potential answerer and who is a potential caller (Schegloff, 1968, 1970, 1986). Regarding the former in the example shown above, we do not know whether there are other members of Kim's household who are also potential answerers of the telephone. Hence turn one, namely, the ringing of the telephone, would not necessarily or automatically "belong" to Kim.

Juxtaposing example (4) with real telephone openings, there is also the interactional issue of how many times an answerer allows a phone to ring before picking up the receiver, moreover, whether to pick it up after the start of a next ring or at the termination of a just prior one (Schegloff, 1968, 1986). These sorts of interactional matters to which participants display orientation at the "mere" ringing of a telephone may have a strong bearing on the shape and form of the talk which gets produced in immediate juxtaposition, for example, generating comments to the effect that the phone rang many times, the answerer was in the shower, and the like. Given considerations such as these, it may be important to display in textbook dialogues that the telephone summons occupies its own turn or interactional slot by which participants begin to make inferences about the upcoming social encounter.

The above points also find resonance with instances found in the corpus which were categorized as "1/2 SA sequence." In these instances, the dialogue does not reveal

that a telephone rang, but the first turn appears to be an answer to a phone presumed to have rung. Fragment (5) is exemplary in which an asterisk indicates that the summons is absent.

(5) [Survival English, p. 90]

*

→ A. Hello.

B. Hello, is Juana there?

A. I'm not sure. Let me check.

In real telephone conversation, the absence or cutting short of a telephone ring, namely, by the second pair part of an adjacency pair, may be a matter of interactional consequence for the interlocutors. For example, on occasions when an answerer picks up a ringing phone too soon or before it has actually rung, this phenomenon often becomes topicalized. Schegloff (1986) discusses one such episode:

(6) [Schegloff, 1986, #2, p. 119]

→ ri-

Joan: Hello?

Cheryl: Hello:,

Joan: Hi:,

→ Cheryl: .hh Y' were s(h)itting by the pho:ne?

Joan: No, I'm (0.3) I'm in the kitchen, but I wz talkin to a friend a mine earlier. I was just putting (0.2) my fried rice on my plate to go each lunch.

The ringing of the telephone is cut short by the answerer who apparently picks up the phone abruptly or before it has produced a full ring. Here the absence of a complete first pair part, namely, a telephone ring (or rings) is shown to be an oriented-to feature of the interaction. Orientation to the absence of the ring even leads to a preemption of other sequences, for example, the HAY (Schegloff, 1986).

In Cheryl's next turn after she produces a greeting to which Joan responds, she focuses on the import of the telephone ring, and what she can infer about Joan's physical proximity to the telephone. This has become the first topic although most certainly it was not intended as the "first topic" by Joan when she initiated the contact. Joan's "first topic" has been changed by virtue of how much or how little the telephone rang. In this instance, we see how interactionally consequential a "trivial" matter such as the ringing of the telephone may be for the participants. It is in light of considerations such as these that the instances contained in the corpus characterized as "1/2 SA sequence" would need to be revised. The ringing of the telephone is more aptly displayed as turn 1 with its attendant action, namely, answering, occupying turn 2.

Furthermore, in another set of instances of which example (7) is illustrative, there was no SA sequence to speak of. Turns 1 and 2, although they appear to be oriented to the interactional tasks of summoning of the party and responding to the summons, these turns are not how they would unfold in a telephone conversation but in co-present interaction.

(7) [Expeditions into English, p. 38]

John: Sue?

Sue: Yes?

John: This is John. John Wilson..

Sue: Oh, John. How are you?

John: Just fine. Long time no see.

The first turns leave the reader with the impression that it is the caller who speaks first. Of course, in real telephone interaction we know that it is the answerer who speaks first. This is reflected in the distribution rule which I have mentioned earlier. It is striking that obvious though this rule may appear to be, it was not a methodic 'practice' of the textbook telephone 'conversations.' As Schegloff (1968) writes about real telephone conversation, intrusions on the distribution rule would create havoc interactionally-speaking:

> ...in attempting to imagine violations, that without the proper operation of the simple distribution rule, it was difficult to keep track of who was who, who the genuine caller and who the violater, the order of events, what remarks were proper for whom, etc. (Schegloff, 1968, p. 1078)

Now aside from the ambiguity of who speaks first, in other instances it was difficult to ascertain the social identities of caller and answerer:

(8) [All Talk, p. 103]

Colette: You really should come and see this hotel. It's beautiful!

Gaby: Oh, really? Does it have a pool?

Colette: No, but there's a lake right next to it.

Gaby: Hmmm, I like pools better.

In the above case, either party could have been caller or answerer. The telephone dialogue does not give a sense that the core sequences of which a telephone beginning are

composed are important, interactionally-speaking. As stated earlier, the opening sequences of a telephone exchange represent actions, moreover, ones which participants manage and orient to in order to arrive at first topic position. Collette and Gaby would need to get through the opening and find ways of topicalizing talk about the hotel. Moreover, it is unclear whether what appears as turn 1 was intended as the first topic of the 'conversation.' The 'talk' shown begins at some point (well) past the opening. That an opening segment occurred preliminary to what is displayed as turn 1 appears to have been assumed. Yet it is difficult for the analyst, not to speak of an ESL learner, to reconstruct the talk and action that ought to have preceded, imagining how Collette or Gaby reached the point which appears as turn 1 of the 'talk.'

Identification Sequences

That the textbook dialogues lacked full or complete SA sequences complicated the analysis of how identification and recognition work was accomplished. When a summons-answer sequence is missing from telephone talk, the 'conversation' does not get ring true from the start. As stated earlier, by offering an answer to a telephone summons (e.g. 'hello'), the answerer provides the caller with an initial voice sample. If that minimal voice sample is recognizable for the caller, the caller often displays recognition in her or his first turn. A 'hi' produced by the caller in the caller's first turn, not only offers a greeting but also accomplishes recognition of the answerer. On the other hand, if the minimal voice sample offered by the answerer (e.g. 'hello') is not recognizable for the caller, this lack of recognition might have other sorts of interactional consequences depending upon, for example, whether the caller ought to have recognized that minimal voice sample.

In the corpus examined, there was a general problem with lack of recognition. This is somewhat puzzling given that half of the dialogues were supposedly 'conversations' between friends or acquaintances, ones for whom the issues of identification and recognition, perhaps, ought not to have been problematic as exemplified in the earlier example (4), which is elaborated and renumbered below.

(9) [Word of Mouth, p. 49]

Kim: (Phone rings) Hello?

Matt: Hi. Is Kim there?

Kim: This is Kim.

→ Matt: Hi, this is Matt. What's up?

Kim: Not much. What are you doing?

Matt: Uh, not much. Are you busy tonight?

Kim: Uh-uh.

Matt: I was wondering if you'd want to go…if you want to go to the movies.

Kim: Sure!

Matt: Okay. Could you do me a favor and call the theater to find out what time the movie starts?

Kim: Sure. Give me five minutes and I'll call you back.

Matt: Okay. Thanks a lot.

Kim: Okay.

Matt: 'Bye.

Kim: 'Bye.

When Matt uses a 'swtichboard request' (Schegloff, 1979) in asking for Kim, he claims not to recognize Kim by voice sample alone i.e., at her production of the utterance "Hello?" Furthermore, when Kim responds by deploying a form of self-identification, she displays that she does not recognize Matt by his voice. Subsequent to that, Matt provides self-identification.

The doing of identification and recognition in this manner is questionable given the later sequences of talk. For example, notice that after Matt offers self-identification, he asks two questions ("What's up?" and "Are you busy tonight?") which are presequences to an invitation to attend the moves ("I was wondering if you'd want to go...if you want to go to the movies."). If Kim and Matt know one another well enough such that they are able to ask each other what they are doing in the opening segment of the talk, one might question why the parties do not recognize each other by voice sample alone. Also, after Kim accepts Matt's invitation to attend the movies, Matt requests that Kim call the theater to find out when the movie begins. That sort of request or action would appear to be predicated on a social relationship in which the participants know one another fairly well such that recognition by voice alone might have been sufficient. And perhaps, more importantly, in a dating situation, as this example appears to be, not to recognize the other by voice sample alone most certainly bears interactional consequences, laying bare issues which speak precisely to the intimacy or lack thereof in the relationship.

Another set of instances is particularly compelling in showing that dialogue 'interactants' offer self-identification when recognition by voice sample alone is the more appropriate route given the identities and relationship of the parties. In next set of

examples, it is emphasized that the first dialogue precedes the second in the textbook i.e., the interaction of the first dialogue is presumed to have occurred before that of the second dialogue.

(10) [LifePrints, p. 34]

On the beach, Ana said good-bye to Willy. She walked up the wooden steps to the lower deck. She looked down. There were big rocks in the ocean below. Then she walked up to the house. The telephone rang.

Ana: Hello?

→ Ken: Ana? It's Ken. I'm in Los Angeles.

Ana: Thank God you're here, Ken. Largo called me in San Francisco. He's looking for me and the LILAC Formula.

Ken: Yes, I know. He was on my plane to Los Angeles.

Ana: What? Largo here, in Los Angeles?

Ken: Listen, Ana. Hide the LILAC formula. Put it in a safe place.

Ana: But what about Largo? Is he going to come here?

Ken: Don't worry, Ana. Oh...Largo's leaving the terminal. I'm going to follow him. Hide the formula, Ana.

(11) [LifePrints, p. 35]

Ken took the number from the motel manager. He dialed Ana's number. The phone rang several times before Ana answered.

→ Ken: Ana, it's Ken. Ken Matthews.

Ana: Where are you? Why didn't you come last night?

Ken: Largo found me. Then he tied me up. But I'm okay.

Ana: Ken, where's Largo now. Is he coming here? What will I do?

Ken: I'll be there soon, Ana. Can you get away from the house?

Ana: Where can I go? It's raining hard, and I don't have a car.

Ken: Think, Ana. What's around there?

Ana: Well, there's a family next door. No, I can't go there. Then they'll be in danger too.

Ken: All right. Lock the door. I won't be long.

Ana; Ken, hurry. Please hurry.

The caller produces self-identification in his first turn. Schegloff (1979) observes that callers frequently invite voice recognition from the answerer by not giving identification. However, when identification by name is given, it frequently occurs in the caller's second turn (as in example 10 above). This set of instances represents a departure from that practice of real telephone conversation.

In these two examples, one might question the need to offer self-identification in the first place. Given that fragment (10) precedes fragment (11), it is odd that Ken initially identifies himself by using first name in an earlier call, but then switches to providing first and last name in a subseqeunt call. Concomitantly, it is puzzling that Ana is able to recognize Ken by first name only in a prior call but not in later one.

In (10), Ken displays some hesitancy in recognizing Ana by her utterance "Hello?" when he produces her name with rising intonation ("Ana?"). Subsequent to that, he offers self-identification. Recognition of Ken by first name only is shown to be sufficient as Ana moves directly to the first topic of the conversation, preempting sequences of greeting and 'how are you.' By preempting these core or 'routine' sequences, her talk displays that something special is going on, and, indeed, there is as she and Ken appear to be in danger. Consequently, the first topic is arrived at earlier in the talk rather than later.

In (11), which, as stated above, occurs after (10) in the textbook, Ken orients to the matter that Ana may not recognize him by first name only; thus he upgrades his self-identification from first name only to first and last name. Again, given the nature of the dangerous situation involving the "LILAC formula" one might have expected mutual recognition by voice sample alone to be sufficient.

Ana might have taken her next turn immediately after Ken's utterance "It's Ken," which would have displayed that they know and refer to one another on a first name basis. Given that they are involved in a life-threatening situation, it is odd that she sometimes recognizes who the caller is by first name only (e.g. example 10), yet on other occasions only recognizes this caller when he provides first and last name as in (11). There is an inconsistency here which in the real world might have (dire) interactional consequences.

And that the parties build the talk of example (11) in a manner which relies on the use of first and last name for recognitional purposes is somewhat at odds with Ana's next turn in which she offers what is possibly an incipient complaint ("Where are you? Why

didn't you come last night?"). This sort of action (e.g. complaint) would appear to be predicated on a social relationship in which the parties know one another on more intimate terms, a relationship in which recognition by voice sample alone would speak loudly to the state of the affairs (e.g. the "LILAC formula") and their relationship, in short, to what is going on in the talk and action as it is organized and mutually oriented to by the participants.

Greeting Sequences

Only 4 of the dialogues examined contained greeting sequences and in 2 of these one participant offers a greeting but it is not returned by the other participant. Fragment (12) represents one such instance.

(12) [Expressways, p. 15]

A. Hello, Steve? This is Jackie.

→ B. Hi. How are you doing?

→ A. Pretty good. How about you?

A. Okay. Listen, I can't talk right now. I'm taking a shower.

A. Oh, okay. I'll call back later.

B. Speak to you soon.

In this example, without an initial SA sequence displayed in the turn-by-turn character of the 'talk,' the roles of caller and answerer are seemingly confounded. The first turn of the dialogue is actually that of the caller and not the answerer who, in real telephone conversation, would be obliged to produce an initial response to a telephone summons (e.g. "hello"). Again, there is a violation of the distribution rule which calls for

the answerer to speak first. In this case, an initial response to the summons by the answerer would have provided the caller with a voice sample that would have served as a resource for identification and recognition purposes.

When Steve, the answerer, produces the greeting "Hi" at the first arrowed turn, he simultaneously displays recognition of the caller, Jackie. In her next turn, however, Jackie does not offer a return greeting but provides a response to the HAY which is of the neutral variety ("Pretty good"). Following from that, she extends the turn by initiating another round of "how are you."

In another instance, the greeting exchange involves a 'big hello' (Schegloff, 1967). This instance is discussed in the next section in which I discuss how-are-you sequences.

How are you? (HAY) Sequences

As there were only 4 dialogues which contained greeting sequences, similarly there were only 4 that contained HAY exchanges. Example (12) above is the only case in which a first HAY sequence is reciprocated by a second. The general absence of HAYs is problematic given that half of the dialogues were intended as personal calls between friends or acquaintances.

All of the answers to the question 'how are you' were of the neutral category ('fine,' 'good,' and 'pretty good'). As stated earlier, answers of this sort are closure relevant; they typically do not lead into the first topic of the conversation. But real callers sometimes convert their answer to the HAY into the first topic. There is one instance in the data which bears some resemblance to this practice of real conversation as exemplified in the case below. The dots which follow various lines in the dialogue are

intended by the author, I presume, to indicate a cut-off or incomplete utterance by the speaker.

(13) [Expeditions into English, p. 82]

Robert Hi, Mom. It's me.

→ Mom: Robert! How are you?

Robert: I need to ask....

Mom: Is everything OK?

Robert: Yes, but I need....

Mom: Oh, good. Do you like school?

Robert: Yeah, school is great.

Mom: How many classes do you have?

Robert: I have five, but Mom....

Mom: What time to your classes start?

Robert: The first one begins at 9:00.

Mom: How long are you in that class?

Robert: Two hours.

Mom: Two hours! Do all the classes last two hours?

Robert: No, the others last one hour.

Mom: That's good. When do you get out of class every day?

Robert: The class is over at 4:00. But Mom...

Mom: That's a long day! Do you have time for lunch?

Robert: Yes, the lunch break starts at noon and ends at 2:00.

Mom: That's good. Well, it's good to talk to you, son. I have to go now. Don't forget to write. Bye.

Robert: But I need some money. Hello? Hello?

This example is an exchange between a mother and her son. Although an initial SA sequence is not provided in the dialogue, it may be inferred that Robert is the caller. He greets his mother by saying "Hi, Mom," and subsequent to that provides a minimally graded recognitional resource ("It's me."). In the next turn, Robert's mother displays recognition of her son when she produces a 'big hello' (Schegloff, 1967), exclaiming "Robert!" Her exclamation accomplishes the task of recognition of the caller and simultaneously offers a greeting. Appended to that is another turn-constructional unit, one in which she initiates an HAY sequence.

However, in the next turn, Robert does not provide an answer to the question "How are you?" The HAY sequence is incomplete because its second pair part is missing. Generally speaking, missing or absent second pair parts are consequential in the real world, forming the basis by which participants make inferences (e.g. the caller is not at home, the recipient of the HAY is giving the cold shoulder, etc.)

The absence of an answer to the HAY provides a sense that something special is going on. Robert preempts a response to the question 'how are you' when he proceeds directly to the first topic, uttering "I need to ask…" This utterance is later shown to be an incipient request for money. But Robert's request is cut off by his mother who asks whether everything is okay. In response, Robert makes a second attempt at producing the utterance which was cut off before ("Yes, but I need…"). Again, he is interrupted by the persistent questioning of his mother ("Oh good. Do you like school?").

At the end of the 'talk,' one sees that Robert never gets to make the request which followed from his mother's asking of 'how are you?" His utterance, "I need to ask…", done as a preemption of an answer to the HAY, moreover, as a move to position the first topic 'earlier' rather than 'later' in the conversation fails dramatically given his mother's nagging questions. When Robert finally "achieves" an opportunity to make his request ("But I need some money."), his mother had already brought the conversation to a closure virtually singlehandedly, not even providing him with an opportunity to say good-bye. This sort of talk and action in real interaction would indeed bear interactional consequences (particularly for Robert and his mother.)

Discussion

None of the 30 openings contained all four of the sequence types canonical of real telephone interaction. Routine, simplistic, or ritualistic as telephone openings appear to be, it is striking that they were not designed by textbook writers in a more authentic fashion. The sort of social order and organization characteristic of 'textbook societies' is often at odds with that of real contexts. In McCarthy and Carter's words, the language of the textbook is frequently reflective of a 'can do' society (McCarthy & Carter, 1994, p. 69). This study reaffirms that notion especially when canonical sequences types are incomplete, taken-for-granted or, even, omitted entirely as in instances of textbook 'conversation' which do not "open" with opening sequences at all. What is particularly acute is that here we are dealing with situations which involve language learners who may rely on the conversational structures and discourse patterns found in the dialogues learned, which they sometimes are asked to memorize, as a means of instruction, a way of learning about how native speakers of English operate in the language.

This study has shown that native speaker intuitions about the language are not necessarily sufficient for the development of natural-like textbook materials (Wolfson, 1986, 1989; Cathcart, 1989). It takes inspection of recorded, naturally occurring telephone beginnings in order to get a sense of how participants construct, reconstruct, and orient to social matters such as doing summoning of the parties, doing identification and recognition work, doing greeting, etc. How those initial actions or sequences are accomplished will affect the shape and trajectory of the talk in important ways. They will have implications for understanding and social action. When interactants engage in conversation, they negotiate meanings and co-construct identities. In the openings of real telephone conversation, speakers align their identities, intimacies, problems, and agendas often relying on four sequence types (Schegloff, 1986). The conversational process reflected as one's discourse competence in the language is, in real time, a fluid and dynamic one.

Telephone talk appears to be one genre about which learners of a target language are particularly sensitive. ESL students frequently state that it is difficult to talk on the telephone, and they avoid such interactions or keep them to a minimal. Perhaps this is due, in part, to a lack of appropriate materials to guide the learner, for example, guidance in how to get through the opening and how to reach the first topic. And notably, many of the textbook dialogues examined did not contain preclosing and closing sequences, but this is another topic for future research. Based on language teaching materials such as these, then, our learners may not be receiving instruction in two major generic components of social interaction: entry into and exit from ordinary telephone talk. This may partially explain our learners' reluctance to converse on the telephone in English.

The suggestion that textbook writers utilize authentic spoken language data for the development of language teaching materials is one that is gaining increasing prominence (Burns, 1998; Carter & McCarthy, 1995; McCarthy, 1991; Scotton & Bernstein, 1988). However, as Burns (1998) indicates, citing Yule (1995), despite the fact that a 'communicative approach' to language teaching has been touted for a number of years, not much progress has been been in terms of pedagogic materials:

> Despite the fact that more than two decades have passed since Henry Widdowson pointed out that 'there is a need to take discourse into account in our teaching of language' (1972), there continues to be a substantial mismatch between what tends to be presented to learners as classroom experiences of the target language and the actual use of that language as discourse outside the classroom. (Yule 1995, p. 185 in Burns, 1998, p. 107)

Indeed, instruction in the discourse structures characteristic of real openings of interaction is an important component to build into a language program. This sort of curriculum development might benefit from discourse analytic studies, such as the one done here, which attempts to help us gain a better understanding of what lurks beneath the notion of conversation, that is, how talk, mutual understanding, and social action are interconnected aspects of everyday ordinary communication. In McCarthy's (1991) words:

> Complete naturalness is probably impossible in the classroom, but the feeling that one is engaging in an authentic activity is important to the learner, as is the feeling that one is being taught authentic and naturally

> occurring structures and vocabulary to use in simulations of real-life talk. Discourse analysis can supply data where intuition cannot be expected to encompass the rich detail and patterning of natural talk. (McCarthy, 1991, pp. 144-145)

The fit between natural telephone talk and that of textbook dialogue is, by and large, inadequate at the level of sequential and interactional concerns. Textbook writers appear to assume that learners will automatically know how to open telephone conversations as if filling slots with appropriate utterances. The 'talk' of the dialogue appears to be linearly organized rather than sequentially constructed. Research done in CA, using naturally occurring data, reveals that engaging in a telephone conversation is an interactionally-demanding task.

Classroom teachers may wish to use insights and findings about language based on discourse analytic studies in curriculum development and lesson planning particularly in situations in which emphasis in on teaching communication or "conversation" (Cathcart, 1989). The teacher might guide learners in analyzing dialogues in terms of what the various turns in the dialogue reveal or "achieve" from an interactional stance and not just from the perspective of learning about decontextualized units of language such as phonological patterns, grammatical form, structure, vocabulary, etc. Obviously, linguistic knowledge alone is insufficient to carry the learner into the social area, but this is not to imply that these decontextualized units of language are not important as well given the language acquisition context.

Teachers might help learners supplement their understanding of the target language by examining textbook 'talk' in terms of the sort of social knowledge that is

evident in the dialogue when one considers talk and action as inextricably tied (Schegloff, 1997, 1986). This approach would be consistent with those who advocate allowing language learners to become ethnographers or observers of language in use (Riggenbach, 1991; Carter & McCarthy, 1995).

With respect to telephone conversation in particular, instructors might begin by having students come to understand that the roles of caller and answerer are forms of social identity, ones which are constructed, moreover, interactionally contingent upon the moment-by-moment character of the talk. As stated at the outset, in an inspection of how telephone openings are achieved in real interaction we get a sense of the coordinated and collaborative character of social interaction.

Burns (1998) comments that although much of the language teaching materials purport to offer 'real-life communication skills,' which is consistent with the shift to communicative language teaching, in fact, very little of this material is actually based on authentic spoken interaction. Textbook writers often appear to rely on their native intuitions of written English grammar when designing pedagogic materials (Burns, 1998). This mode of working 'deauthenticates' speech (Slade, 1986, 1990), as this study has reconfirmed, and the 'natural order of spoken discourse,' from meaning to form, is reversed (Burns, 1998).

Some of the more recent work in CA and applied linguistics has begun to explore interconnections between these two academic disciplines, considering ways in which research done in CA might be "applied" to the second or foreign language acquisition context (e.g., Schegloff, 2000; Wong 1984, 1994, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c; Wong & Olsher, 2000; Markee, 1999; Liddicoat, 1997; Seedhouse, 1998; Wagner, 1996, 1998; Firth,

Firth, 1996; Firth & Wagner, 1997). Wong (2000a) claims that CA may provide a sound basis for the study of interaction in second language acquisition, because it is based on those features of the context which are relevant for the participants. She further indicates that applied linguists, generally, have not focused on aspects of turn-taking and sequence structure as vital considerations in an understanding of issues in language acquisition and, perhaps, more attention ought to be paid to these areas in future work.

Perhaps it is time for language teachers and materials writers to gain deeper insights into some of the systematic practices of naturally occurring conversation given the increasing pedagogical emphasis on language as discourse, language as social process (McCarthy & Carter, 1994). Herein lies another form of natural language i.e. spoken grammar about which learners and teachers must reckon, if they have not done so already (Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson, 1996; Schegloff, 1996, 1979).

Conclusion

Research efforts thus far have not employed CA as a handle from which to evaluate the naturalness or authenticity of textbook 'conversation.' This study continues a general search for how to "apply" CA in applied linguistics, looking to see what there is to unbundle and unbridle, to understand and appreciate, with respect to talk, language pedagogy, and the classroom context.

References

Burns, A. (1998). Teaching speaking. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. 18, 102 – 123.

Candlin, C. (1991). General editor's preface. In McCarthy and Carter (1994). Language as Discourse. London and New York: Longman.

Carter, R. and M. McCarthy (1995). Grammar and spoken language. Applied Linguistics. 16, 141-158.

Cathcart, R. (1989). Authentic discourse and the survival English curriculum. TESOL Quarterly, 23, 105-126.

Drummond, K. and R. Hopper (1991). Misunderstanding and its remedies: telephone miscommunication. In Coupland, N., H. Giles, and J. Wiemann. "Miscommunication" and Problematic Talk. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. Journal of Pragmatics, 26, 237-259.

Firth, A. and J. Wagner (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. The Modern Language Journal, 81, iii. 285-300.

Godard, D. (1977). Same setting, different norms: Phone call beginnings in France and the United States. Language in Society, 6, 209-219.

Hatch, E. (1992). Discourse and Language Education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) Structures in Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Hopper, R. (1992). Telephone conversation. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hopper, R. (1989). Sequential ambiguity in telephone openings: 'what are you doin'. Communication Monographs, 56, 240-252.

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1991). Opening sequences in Dutch telephone conversations. In D. Boden and D. Zimmerman (eds.), Talk and Social Structure (pp. 232-250). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hymes, D. (1967). Models of the interaction of language and social setting. Journal of Social Issues 23(1), 8-38.

Hymes, D. H. 1972. On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.), Sociolinguistics: selected readings. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Jefferson, G. (1980). On 'trouble-premonitory' response to inquiry. Sociological Inquiry, 50 (34), 153-185.

Liddicoat, A. (1997). Interaction, social structure, and second language use: a response to Firth and Wagner. The Modern Language Journal, 81, iii, 313-317.

Lindstrom, A. (1994). Identification and recognition in Swedish telephone conversation openings. Language in Society, 23, 2331-252.

Markee, N. (2000). Conversation Analysis. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McCarthy, M. (1991). Discourse analysis for language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M. and R. Carter (1994). Language as discourse. London: Longman.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ochs, E., E. Schegloff, and S. Thompson (1996). Interaction and Grammar. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Riggenbach, R. (1991). Discourse analysis and spoken language instruction. In W. Grabe et al. (eds.) Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 11, Discourse analysis (pp. 152-163). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1975). Everyone has to lie. In M. Sanches and B. G. Blount (ed.) Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Use (pp. 57-80). New York: Academic Press.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. and G. Jefferson (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language, 50, 696-735.

Schegloff, E. (1967). The first five seconds. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Schegloff, E. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. In American Anthropologist 70(6), 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. (1970). Opening sequencing. Revised dissertation chapter. Unpublished manuscript.

Schegloff, E. (1979). Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In Psathas, G. (ed.), Everyday Language Studies in Ethnomethodology (pp. 23 – 78), New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc.

Schegloff, E. (1986). The routine as achievement. Human Studies, 9, 111-151.

Schegloff, E. (1993). Telephone conversation. In R. E. Asher (ed.), Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 9 (pp. 4547-4549). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Schegloff, E. (1995). Sequence Organization. Unpublished manuscript.

Schegloff, E. (1996). Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction. In Ochs, E., E. Schegloff, and S. Thompson (eds.) Interaction and Grammar (pp. 52 – 125). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (1997). Practices and actions: boundary cases of other-initiated repair. Discourse Processes, 23, 499-545.

Schegloff, E. (forthcoming). Answering the phone. G. Lerner (ed.), Conversation Analysis: Studies From the First Generation.

Schegloff, E. and H. Sacks (1973). Opening up closings. Semiotica, 7, 289-327.

Scotton, C. and J. Bernstein (1988). Natural conversations as a model for textbook dialogue. Applied Linguistics, 9, 372-384.

Seedhouse, P. (1998). CA and the analysis of foreign language interaction: a reply to Wagner. Journal of Pragmatics, 30, 85-102.

Sifanou, M. (1989). On the telephone again! Differences in telephone behavior: England versus Greece. Language in Society, 18, 527-544.

Slade, D. (1986). Teaching casual conversation to adult ESL learners. Prospect 2(1), 68-88.

Slade, D. (1990). Teaching casual conversation. Paper presented at the National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Spoken Discourse Project Workshop. Macquarie University. Synney, September 1990.

Wagner, J. (1996). Foreign language acquisition through interaction – a critical review of research on conversational adjustments. Journal of Pragmatics, 26, 215-235.

Wagner, J. (1998). On doing being a guinea pig – A response to Seedhouse. Journal of Pragmatics, 30, 103-113.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Wolfson, N. (1986). Research methodology and the question of validity. TESOL Quarterly, 20(4), 236-244.

Wolfson, N. (1989). Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Wong, J. (1984). Using conversational analysis to evaluate telephone conversations in English as a second language textbooks. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.

Wong, J. (1994). A conversation analytic approach to the study of repair in native-nonnative speaker English conversation: The element 'yeah' in same-turn repair and delayed next turn repair initiation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Wong, J. (2000a). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/nonnative speaker English conversation. Applied Linguistics, 21(2). 244-267.

Wong, J. (2000b). The token 'yeah' in native/nonnative speaker English conversation. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33(1). 39-67.

Wong, J. (in press, 2000c). Repetition in conversation: A look at 'first and second sayings.' Research on Language and Social Interaction. 407-424.

Wong, J. and D. Olsher (forthcoming, 2000). Reflections on conversation analysis and nonnative speaker talk: An interview with Emanuel A. Schegloff. Issues in Applied Linguistics, 11(1).

Yule, G. (1995). The paralinguistics of reference: Representation in reported discourse. In G. Cook and B. Seidhofer (eds.) Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics (pp. 185-196). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Notes:

[1] For other studies on telephone talk, see Hopper (1992, 1989), Drummond & Hopper (1991), Houtkoop-Steenstra (1991), Lindstrom (1994), Sifanou (1989), Godard (1977), etc.

[2] But see the earlier section on summons-answer sequence for a brief discussion of cultural variation in telephone openings in Dutch and Swedish conversation.

[3] See Schegloff (1995) for a discussion of how a speaker can produce a second HAY to display that it was specifically done as a reciprocal HAY response.

[4] The textbooks examined were:

1. Word of Mouth, 1996 (Heinle & Heinle)
2. Day by Day, 1994 (Prentice-Hall)
3. All Talk, 1992 (Heinle & Heinle)
4. Life Prints, Book 2, 1993 (New Readers Press)
5. Expeditions into English, 1990 (Prentice-Hall)
6. Survival English, Book 3, 1995 (Prentice-Hall)
7. New American Streamline: Departures, 1994 (Oxford University)
8. Expressways, 1988 (Prentice-Hall)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE